

WREXHAM COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

MEETING OF 7TH MARCH 2016

ADDENDUM

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF COMMUNITY WELLBEING AND DEVELOPMENT

This report summarises information received since the Agenda was compiled including, as appropriate, suggested amendments to recommendations in the light of that information. It also lists those people wishing to address the Committee.

Where the Council has received a request to address the Committee, the applications concerned will be considered first in the order indicated in the table below. The remaining applications will then be considered in the order shown on the original agenda unless indicated by the Chair.

ITEM 4 – DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS

Page Nos	Community	Planning Ref	Speaker Against	Speaker For
32 – 48	MIN	P/2015/0644		√
62 – 85	GLY	P/2015/0810	√	√
86 - 100	WRR	P/2015/0812	√	
120 - 135	BRN	P/2015/0962	√	√

Pages 32 – 48 MIN P/2015/0644

Five Crosses Inn, Ruthin Road, Bwlchgwyn, Wrexham

SPEAKER: *FOR – Mr Tom Hallett (Representing Agent)*

Consultations

Orally advised that the Community Council requests that alterations to the following items:

- Pedestrian refuge across Minera Hall junction – to be further away from the junction with Ruthin Road. It is considered that coaches and HGVs will hit the proposed refuge in proposed position, and consideration should be given to vehicles that need to access Jordans Garage (on corner of Minera Hall Road and Ruthin Road)
- Possible footway widening along A525 Ruthin Road – possibly in front of the property known as Bryn Derfel (south west side of Ruthin Road) because this is less than 1m wide. The feasibility of this work should be considered.

Representations

Highways have confirmed that there is no need for the suggested alterations as raised by the Community Council in order to ensure adequate pedestrian safety.

Applicant's Submission

The applicant has examined the additional matters which have been raised by the Community Council, and has raised the following:

- The pedestrian refuge was located in the position shown to ensure that there is a refuge area where the crossing distances are greater, and it will be along the desire line for pedestrian movements north –south along the southwest side of Ruthin Road. Moving the island to a narrower point is of little benefit as crossing distances are already smaller. The swept path analysis (including details for a large coach) is shown to be acceptable for the vehicles using the junction, and the existing garage access is unaffected. Vehicles will be able to negotiate the proposed refuge island.

- b) It is noted that there are number of other existing refuge island crossings to the other side of the Ruthin Road carriage before this narrow section of pavement on the south west side of Ruthin Road, and therefore this localised widening is deemed unnecessary in this instance. Also the re-alignment of the highway at this point could result in vehicle kerb strikes.

Observations

The issues and feasibility of the items as raised by the Community Council has been assessed by the applicant, and they do not believe that any further alterations are necessary, and Highways has confirmed that they are also not necessary in order to secure an appropriate degree of pedestrian safety.

Recommendation

Unaltered.

Pages 62 – 85 **GLY P/2015/0810**

Cae Mor, Llwyn Mawr, Pontfadog, Llangollen

SPEAKER: *AGAINST – Mr Ed Rayner (Representing Local Objectors)*
 FOR – Mr Julian Morris (Applicant)

Consultations

In respect of possible culvert within the site:

Flood Officer	Satisfied that investigations are undertaken prior to commencement of construction on site, to identify if a culverted watercourse is present. Suitable condition would be required. If a culvert is found, any diversion would require additional consent from the Local Flood Authority.
---------------	--

Representations

In respect of the additional information, 3 further letters have been received raising the following:

- Part of the adjacent field (west of the road leading to Cae Mor) could be used as a new road to serve the existing farm if the existing highway is too steep.
- The failure to locate the farm building close to the house will allow the current house to be sold off, and therefore it should be tied to the poultry unit.
- There is no mains water, and where will the water be sourced.
- Within 10 years, the original fields that were connected with the farm were sold, and these contained flatter areas.
- Whilst the principle of a chicken unit is not objected to, the location of this unit is not suitable.
- The assessment into the impacts on private water supplies does not consider the impacts on all properties that are below the site. Nantgwryd Uchaf uses a private water supply and it does not use the same supply as stated for Llangwryd Uchaf. Also the assessment does not consider the property of Craig Yr Oryn. The abstraction points for properties below the site are not fully known, and the report does not identify those positions, and therefore it cannot be assumed that only property is affected. Not reassured by the submitted documentation.
- The impact of manure on water supplies is not assessed. Although it is stated that the manure on scratching land is unlikely to exceed risks from other livestock use, no evidence has been provided to support this. At an average stocking density of 8 ewes per acre, the 20 acre site would support grazing for 160 ewes. 16,000 hens will produce more waste than a flock of sheep, and the manure will have a higher nitrogenous content, and could result in higher use of antibiotics. The area directly around the building will be subject to a higher build-up of manure, and this has not been considered, even if the hens will be moved around various paddocks. The report does not address previous concerns.
- No mention has been made of the substantial groundworks that will be necessary, and this might have both short and long term effects for springs and groundwater.

- The viewpoints from B4579 has only assessed motorists, and yet riders, walkers and cyclists also use these routes. Cycle traffic has increased.
- Only 6 of the 12 viewpoints have been assessed. It is unclear why the visual amenity of local residents has not been considered as receptors. Assessment of viewpoints is entirely subjective.
- Existing screening relies upon them being maintained in their current or improved state, but this can only be possible if the owner has control over all that screening, and maintained heights.
- The examples of similar nearby agricultural buildings are all forming part of existing farmsteads (except Cae Mor Ucha), and are not isolated.
- Development is out of keeping. Without wider awareness of the areas' special qualities, those special qualities will gradually be eroded and lost due to the cumulative impacts of impacts of ongoing, piecemeal changes of which this is one.
- A significant line of a hedgerow will be removed, and there are too many assumptions about impacts to wildlife.
- The new track should have native hedgerows on either side – to be in character. Planting plan is limited.
- Noise during construction phase
- The economic benefit is unproven. There might be short term benefit in the construction stage, but this is not sustainable. The application does not quantify that actual number of jobs/hours proposed, no whether these are in addition to current requirements for the land. Profit is not guaranteed. Exceptional circumstances need to justify an isolated building. Difficult to justify over-riding other considerations in favour of economic benefit/essential agricultural need when this is not quantified.

A letter from the Community Council has been received, and this raises similar issues as already mentioned above. The viewpoints in the LVIA are not considered to be representative of local views, and some give a distorted view. It is also considered that the impacts have not been fully considered in sufficient detail.

A further letter has been received showing a photo towards the site from Old Road at Dolywern. This has been submitted to demonstrate that the site is much more visible than suggested.

Applicant's Submission

The applicant has submitted some further information in relation to the published report. This information was circulated by the applicant to all Members of the Planning Committee on Friday 4th March 2016. It also contains a letter of support from "Oaklands" who are involved in the operational use of the site. The issues raised in support of the application are addressed in the main body of the report.

The applicant has submitted a further letter from their landscape consultant, to confirm that they believe that the officer's report is misleading in some areas with regards to interpretation of the submitted LVIA, and the report makes no mention of the photomontages. The full findings and conclusions have not been reported. Although the building will be located within an area of high/medium sensitivity, the LVIA identifies that the changes to the landscape would be moderate or minor beyond the site itself, and would not cause a material change to the character of the area. Some of the montages were taken in winter, and this illustrates impact in winter months. The conclusions of the LVIA are clear – there would not be any significant effects on the landscape fabric, the character of the landscapes beyond the site, or the visual amenity of residents, walkers, equestrians and cyclists in study area or motorists on any B road and local road network.

Observations

These matters do not alter the conclusions regarding the scheme.

Despite the points raised by their landscape consultant, the full content of the LVIA has been examined as part of the report, and the extra information still does not alter the conclusions regarding the development.

The photo from an objector does not show the site area of the proposed building, but seems to include part of the range area to the east of the proposed building.

Recommendation

Unchanged.

Pages 86 – 100 WRR P/2015/0812

Land North of Total Fitness, Stansty Road, Wrexham

SPEAKER: *AGAINST – Mr Ian Carson (Objector)*

Consultations

Community Council: Whilst the Community Council agrees that residential development of this site would be an appropriate use of this under used area of land, unfortunately, the access and adjacent roads and road layout would make it impractical without major Highway improvements. The Council, therefore **OBJECT** to the Planning Application on Highway Grounds as follows:-

1. The proposed access is too close to the New Road / Rhosddu Road and Stansty Road junction.
 - There is insufficient visibility from the development site access of traffic coming from the Town Centre along Rhosddu Road into Stansty Road. The speed limit is 30 MPH and traffic frequently travels at this speed into Stansty Road.
 - At peak times, Stansty Road by the site access is grid-locked; traffic on Stansty Road cannot exit onto Rhosddu Road / New Road because that road is busy with traffic, so the traffic on Stansty Road can back up to the railway underpass. Because the underpass is not wide enough for normal two way traffic, the backed up traffic holds back the traffic coming from Rhosddu Road / New Road, so the road in front of the site access is blocked in both directions.
2. Local Members are extremely concerned that Stansty Road has reached saturation point. As noted above, the junction of Stansty Road with Rhosddu Road / New Road is frequently grid-locked, and the underpass of the railway bridge is not two way, and causes a back-up of traffic.

There are 2 local Primary Schools close by (Ysgol Plas Coch, and Rhosddu C P School) The Glyndwr University, and the Wrexham Football Ground which hosts Wrexham F C, the Crusaders Rugby Club, and International Football and Rugby matches both have main accesses to their Car Parks and facilities from Crispin Lane off Stansty Road. Stansty Road also provides direct access from the East side of Wrexham to the Plas Coch Retail Park which has Sainsbury's, Currys / PC World, Sports Direct, Boots, Aldi, Homebase, Argos, and other smaller establishments.

No highway improvements have been carried out to Stansty Road despite the increased traffic flows generated by the Plas Coch Retail Park.

3. The underpass under Stansty railway bridge has already been identified by the Highway Department as being sub-standard, and that view was endorsed by the Welsh Assembly who gave a grant to the Highways Department. However, no improvements were made to the underpass which still remains sub-standard. The erection of houses on this site would only exacerbate the situation.
4. A recent Housing Development on the former Remploy site nearby has also added to the traffic problems, with no improvements to the highway.
5. Whilst the Application Site has been laid out as a Car park for visitors to Total

Fitness, it has always remained virtually empty as a surplus of parking spaces was provided. It cannot, therefore, be said that the loss of a number of car parking spaces as a result of the proposed development will ease the traffic flow. On the contrary, the facilities at Total Fitness are not to be decreased, so the number of visitors to Total Fitness will continue as before, and the traffic generated by the proposed development will be additional.

6. If the proposed developers were to provide a footbridge over the railway (in conjunction with the Developers of the Remploy site) the walkway in the underpass could be removed which would enable the carriageway to be widened to make the traffic in that direction more free flowing.

Members also made the following comments about omissions in the Application which would normally result in the refusal of Planning Permission:-

- A) It was noted that no provision is made on the plans for play facilities / open space.
- B) It was also noted that the Applicants Design and Access Statement failed to address the issue of additional traffic movements arising from the proposed development, both during construction, and as homes.
- C) Members would also draw attention to the requirement for Affordable Housing in the Development, and that the Development is likely to produce a requirement for additional School places.

Local Member: Councillor Steve Wilson has made the following comments:

1. I was initially concerned whether there were sufficient car parking spaces on the rest of the site for Total Fitness. This concern seems to have been addressed by Planning Application P/2016/0141.(subject to its approval);
2. I still have concerns re visibility for vehicles leaving the site-but this has been an ongoing issue from this location;
3. A Section 106 contribution to off-site Public Open Space provision for Rhosddu Road Play Area would also be appreciated and, in my mind, would compensate for no provision on the actual site.

Observations

I will comment the above issues not specifically addressed in my main report below:

Impact upon Stansty Road Underpass

As noted in my main report, the development will result in a smaller increase in traffic than the previously approved office development. No conditions to require improvements or alterations to the underpass were imposed on the permission for that development. Highways have not advised that any improvements to the underpass are necessary in order to allow the development to take place. As such it would not be possible to sustain a refusal on the grounds that no improvements are proposed nor would it be possible to justify imposing a condition to require a scheme of improvements to be implemented.

Affordable Housing

Policy H7 (affordable housing) is only applicable to developments of 25 or more dwellings.

Recommendation

Unchanged

Cae Bach, Ellesmere Road, Bronington

SPEAKER: *AGAINST – Mr Leslie Smith (Representing objector)*
 FOR – Mr Rob Middleton (Applicant)

Applicant's submissions

The applicant's agent has responded to the objections that there was no pre-application discussion with the community by forwarding emails and plans that he sent to the Community Council in November asking for comments.

Representations

1 additional representation expressing the following concerns:

- Serious objection to the project;
- Further spoliation of the area is to be deplored.

Observations

The above matters are addressed in my main report.

Recommendation

The following additional conditions are added:

13. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the Reasonable Avoidance Measures with Regards to Great Crested Newt set out on page 6 of the Worsfold and Bowen Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey dated 8 December 2015.

Reason: In order to protect wildlife interests, which are afforded special protection.

14. No part of the development shall commence until a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No development or other operations shall take place except in strict accordance with the Method Statement as is approved. The Method Statement shall include the following:

- a) A specification for tree protection fencing and ground protection measures that comply with British Standard 5837:2012;
- b) A Tree Protection Plan showing the location of the trees to be removed and retained with their crown spreads, Root Protection Areas, Construction Exclusion Zones, and location of protective fencing and ground protection measures accurately plotted;
- c) A full specification for any access, driveway, path, underground services or wall foundations within retained tree Root Protection Areas or Construction Exclusion Zone, including any related sections and method for avoiding damage to retained trees;
- d) Details of general arboricultural matters including proposed practices with regards to cement mixing, material storage and fires;
- e) Details of the frequency of supervisory visits and procedures for notifying the findings of such visits to the Local Planning Authority;
- f) Method for protecting retained trees during demolition works;
- g) Details of all proposed tree works, including felling and pruning.

Reason: To ensure the work is carried out to accepted arboricultural practices for the long term wellbeing of the tree(s).

**ALL OTHER ITEMS WILL BE TAKEN IN ORDER SHOWN
ON THE ORIGINAL AGENDA**

Pages 21 – 31

GWE P/2016/0270

Consultations

Community Council: Opposed to application as the proposal will increase impact from existing and proposed new residential development adjacent to the busy A541 Mold Road. Turning out of Church Street on A541, particularly at busy times of the day, is nigh on impossible and with a new development it will be even more difficult. Further studies of the traffic impact should be undertaken.

Observation

The highway issues are addressed in the main report and whilst it is recognised that the road is busy at peak times the traffic generation from a development of this size (4 properties) will be negligible and will not adversely affect highway safety.

Pages 104 – 166

WRR P/2015/0900

Applicant's submissions

The applicant has submitted detailed drawings of the windows to be installed in the development.

Observations

The window details are acceptable.

There is a significant lime tree adjacent to the north-eastern boundary of the site that contributes towards the character of the street scene and Conservation Area. A condition to ensure it is protected throughout the proposed works is therefore needed.

Recommendation

Condition 02 be amended as follows:

02. The development shall only be carried out in strict accordance with the details shown on the following approved drawing and contained within the application documentation:

- i) 1477/F03/S02/Revision-E: Site Plan;
- ii) 1477/F03/004/Revision-A: Proposed Elevations;
- iii) 1477/F03/005/Revision-A: Proposed Elevations;
- iv) 1477/F03/001/Revision C: Ground Floor Plan;
- v) 1477/F03/002/Revision D: First Floor Plan;
- vi) 1477/F03/003/Revision C: Second Floor Plan;
- vii) 1477/F03/S04: External Works
- viii) ADL130 Revision A: Landscaping;
- ix) 2390-D-31-102 Revision P1: Typical Window Details, Cedar Feature;
- x) 2390-D-31-104: Typical Window Detail, Above Entrance Window – North West (Front) Elevation
- xi) 2390-D-31-105: Typical Window Details, Second Floor Level (SFS Construction).

Condition 10 be amended as follows:

Prior to their installation details of the decorative/protective finishes of all new or replacement windows and doors shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Windows shall thereafter only be installed in strict accordance with such details as are approved.

The following condition be added:

19: No part of the development shall commence until a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No development or other operations shall take place except in strict accordance with the Method Statement as is approved. The Method Statement shall include the following:

- a) A specification for tree protection fencing and ground protection measures that comply with British Standard 5837:2012;
- b) A Tree Protection Plan showing the location of the trees to be removed and retained with their crown spreads, Root Protection Areas, Construction Exclusion Zones, and location of protective fencing and ground protection measures accurately plotted;
- c) A full specification for any access, driveway, path, underground services or wall foundations within retained tree Root Protection Areas or Construction Exclusion Zone, including any related sections and method for avoiding damage to retained trees;
- d) Details of general arboricultural matters including proposed practices with regards to cement mixing, material storage and fires;
- e) Details of the frequency of supervisory visits and procedures for notifying the findings of such visits to the Local Planning Authority;
- f) Method for protecting retained trees during demolition works;
- g) Details of all proposed tree works, including felling and pruning.

Reason: To ensure the work is carried out to accepted arboricultural practices for the long term wellbeing of the tree(s).